



## **Regional Airport Planning Committee**

October 5, 2007

**TO:** Regional Airport Planning Committee  
**FROM:** Staff of the Regional Airport Planning Committee  
**SUBJECT:** Draft Minutes of July 27, 2007 Regional Airport Planning Committee

1. **Call to Order.** Chair Waldeck called the meeting to order at 9:40 A.M.
2. **Roll Call.** Present were: Barrie (CalTrans), Bates (BCDC) Chu (MTC) Fredericks (Marin County), McKenney (OAK), Mossar (BCDC), Novak (FAA), Salmon (Sonoma County), Rinsler (SFO), Spering (MTC), Waldeck (Chair) (BCDC) and Ward (ABAG).
3. **Chairman's Report.** Mr. Waldeck announced that Charles McGlashan, Supervisor from Marin County has stepped down from RAPC, due to a scheduling conflict that prevented him from attending RAPC's meetings. He thanked Mr. McGlashan for his service to the Committee and announced that Marin County has appointed Alice Fredericks, Town Council member from Tiburon to replace Mr. McGlashan on the Committee. He welcomed Ms. Fredericks to the Committee.

He said RAPC's next meeting will be held on September 28, 2007. This meeting will be conducted as a public forum to provide an opportunity for an open dialogue between the Committee and the public regarding the conclusions to be drawn from the Phase 1 expert panels during the past year. This forum will also provide an opportunity for public input on the RAPC's work program for Phase 2.

Mr. Waldeck announced that the FAA and San Francisco International Airport are planning a press conference to announce the award of grant funding to MTC to support RAPC's work during Phase 2. He asked Mr. Novak from the FAA to provide the Committee with an update on the grants and the press conference.

Mr. Novak said that MTC will be awarded three grants to support RAPC's work during Phase 2. He said the grants total about \$600,000 and would support work in three areas: (1) general support for a variety of analyses in Phase 2, such as regional airport capacity, demand management, institutional options, etc.; (2) an inventory of vacant land surrounding general aviation airports; and (3) an updated aviation forecast. He said that the FAA views RAPC's work as a national model, and wants to highlight the award of the grants at a press conference on August 3, 2007 at SFO, and would like to have RAPC well represented there. Ms. Rinsler

---

Joseph P. Bort MetroCenter • 101 Eighth Street • Oakland, CA 94607-4700

510.817.5700 • TDD/TTY 510.817.5769 • FAX 510.817.5848

---

added that SFO is very pleased to host the press conference, and acknowledged the national significance of RAPC's work.

4. **Public Comment Period.** Mr. Waldeck asked if any member of the public would like to speak on any issue that is not on the agenda. No one wished to speak.

5. **Minutes, Meeting Of June 22, 2007.** Mr. Ward noted that the June 22<sup>nd</sup> minutes incorrectly identify him as a MTC representative and requested that the minutes be corrected to show that he represents ABAG. Mr. Ward moved, and Ms. Mossar seconded approval of the minutes, with that revision. The motion passed unanimously.

6. **Alternatives for Phase 1 Public Workshop.** Doug Kimsey outlined staff's proposed alternative approaches for conducting the September public workshop to solicit public input on the conclusions and recommendations RAPC will adopt from its Phase 1 expert panels. He said that the staff had observed a relatively low level of public involvement during the Phase 1 panel discussions; therefore, staff recommends holding only one workshop. He presented three options for the Committee to consider: (1) hold an evening workshop sometime in early September 2007, then act on the Phase 1 findings at a September 28, 2007 RAPC meeting; (2) hold the workshop at the September 28<sup>th</sup> RAPC meeting, and act on the Phase 1 findings at the October 26<sup>th</sup> RAPC meeting; and (3) hold the workshop during the first half of the September 28<sup>th</sup> RAPC meeting, then act on the Phase 1 findings during the second half of the meeting. This option includes potentially holding over any controversial findings that generate substantial public input to the October 26<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mr. Kimsey noted that the October 26<sup>th</sup> meeting had been rescheduled to October 15<sup>th</sup>, due to a conflict with a joint MTC-ABAG meeting.

Mr. Ward said that holding the public workshop separate from the Committee meeting was preferable, because it demonstrates to the public that the Committee takes their input seriously, and this approach will provide time to incorporate public input into the staff's final recommendation before the Committee considers it. Ms. Mossar agreed that having the workshop at a separate meeting from the meeting where the Committee takes action on the findings and recommendations makes sense. Ms. McKenney said that an evening workshop was a superior alternative, because it provided greater opportunities for public participation. She volunteered the mailing lists of the Oakland airport to expand the outreach for the workshop.

Ms. Mossar noted that the outreach used for the recent MTC federal planning certification evaluation had worked very well, and suggested that model for this outreach effort. She suggested that staff needed to ensure that adequate outreach efforts to the general aviation community were included, and should include website postings that explain what the workshop is about and how the public can participate in the proceedings. She suggested that this be supplemented by hard copy documents and a press release. The Committee agreed that the optimal approach would be to hold an evening meeting in early to mid-September that covers both the Phase 1 findings and conclusions, and the proposed work program for Phase 2. The Committee wanted to ensure that the outreach included web-postings providing "guiding steps" for public participation, including opportunities to provide written comments outside of the public workshop for those unable to attend.

7. **Public Comment.** David Lewis from Save the Bay said he supported Mr. Ward's suggestion that the workshop and meeting for Committee action should be separate. He also supported soliciting public input on the Phase 2 work program during the workshop. He said that the experts are constrained in their thinking, and the Committee can encourage the public to express a broader vision, even though some of the comments will be off-point. He said some

new ideas worthy of consideration may come out of that process. He said it could encourage participation. He suggested that because RAPC's work is viewed as a national model, we may be out in front of other areas in the country that we're viewing as sources of potential solutions.

In response to Mr. Lewis' question, Mr. Waldeck asked how staff could incorporate Phase 2 work program considerations into the workshop. Mr. Kimsey said that the staff would develop a way to achieve this, since it was their intention to seek this kind of feedback. He said that there are some recommendations in staff's conclusions from Phase 1 for further exploration of issues identified there, and our recommendations for Phase 2 include investigation of new issues, and the staff recommends that the Committee seek public input on both of these topics at the workshop.

Mr. Waldeck noted that the public input and involvement in the last (2001) update to the Regional Airport System Plan Analysis was significant, and asked whether there were particular issues that generated that level of interest. Mr. Ward said that the issue of new runways drove the process to some degree and brought out lots of people who may not otherwise have participated. He said RAPC took up the noise issue at the same time, and that brought out a number of people, including residents of Tiburon. He said the degree of participation for this process will likely be far less. He said his hope is that people will engage on some of these issues, including the creation of a regional airport planning committee that has some real authority. He said he hoped that the staff presents this idea among others at the public workshop for feedback, so that the public and the Committee can evaluate the legal and other issues surrounding this topic. Mr. Brittle added that in Marin County, there were a number of noise issues, due in part to concerns about runway expansion, and due to anomalous weather conditions that generated a lot of over-flights.

Mr. Waldeck noted that Mr. Ward served as Chair of the Committee for four or five years, and Mr. Sperling for at least two years, so there is considerable experience on the Committee. Mr. Ward noted that RAPC held noise workshops throughout the region for the previous RASPA update. He agreed with staff's recommendation that only one workshop be held on Phase 1, but recommended that the Committee and staff gauge the level of response at the first workshop and see whether additional workshops in other areas of the Bay are appropriate.

Ms. Mossar said it makes sense that public involvement in this workshop will be low, but that does not mean that the issues that brought people out in 2001 are gone; they are just buried under a lot of technical data, and are still with us today, such as capacity shortfalls that may occur soon. She supported the concept of a regional planning authority. She suggested that it was incumbent on the staff and the Committee to bring these issues to a level of public understanding today, because when RAPC or some other authority discusses capacity improvements, such as new runways or airports in the future, the public is going to raise the same issues then that they raised last time capacity improvements were proposed. She said it was erroneous to assume that low participation in RAPC's current work meant that there was less public concern about the issues. She said this was due more to the fact that there was no current project proposal to increase aviation capacity in the region, and we are just getting back to pre-9/11 air traffic levels. She said RAPC should assume that the public interest has not changed, and we should do everything we can to accommodate public input.

Mr. Novak said that the current defined boundaries of the Bay Area aviation market may be inaccurate. He said the FAA is noticing that aviation activity in the Bay Area is spilling east to Merced, north to Santa Rosa and even further north. He said RAPC may need to outreach to these communities for input, because they are affected by Bay Area aviation traffic.

Mr. Bates agreed that we have become a mega region. He said that RAPC may want to float some possibilities for these communities to consider, such as a new airport in areas where there is more available land.

Mr. Lewis said that in 2000, all three major airports had expansion programs under consideration and each of those projects had extensive public processes underway. Each had stakeholder groups that were involved. The public learned about RAPC's work in these other public processes, in addition to the press coverage. He said Ms. McKenney's offer to share lists of stakeholders, and reaching out to communities with general aviation airports would help to expand public awareness and participation in RAPC's current work.

Mr. Kimsey summarized that the direction from the Committee was to hold a public workshop at an evening meeting sometime in mid-September, and the Committee would hold a meeting in mid-October to take action on Phase 1 findings and recommendations and Phase 2 work scope. He said that if there was a lot of public input, then possibly the action meeting could be held in November. He said that the input process would include opportunities for email and written comments after the workshop, prior to the October 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. He said staff will work closely with the commercial and general aviation airports to reach out to their interested parties to ensure an expansive outreach effort. Mr. Waldeck added that for those unfamiliar with the process, it would be desirable to have a guided approach for the comment process to enable them to find their way. Mr. Ward questioned whether it was logistically feasible for staff of the three agencies to prepare this kind of input opportunity on a website? Mr. Kimsey said as part of the email transmittal, recipients could be directed to MTC's webpage where we could have a descriptive piece on what the process is, and we could develop a fact sheet that could be distributed through regular mail, and electronically that describes the process, and briefly the content. Mr. Waldeck suggested that a press release would also be beneficial. Ms. Mossar noted that the publicity for federal review of MTC's public participation program has been very successful, as she received hundreds of emails about it, and, if it could be repeated for RAPC, it would work well. She added that we definitely need to tap into the GAA community.

## **8. Phase 1 Summary and Draft Staff Findings and Recommendations.**

**a. Aviation Trends Panel.** Mr. Waldeck introduced Chris Brittle, who presented staff's summary of the Phase 1 expert panels, and its draft findings and recommendations for the Committee's consideration and comment. He said that the panelists were given an opportunity to comment on staff's summary of the panels, but few did. He said that the staff's recommended findings are not a summary of what the panelists said, but are staff's suggestions. He said the Committee and airports may have other ideas about what the conclusions and recommendations should be. He acknowledged Andy Richard's contribution from the FAA who moderated three of the four panels.

He then summarized the findings and recommendations in the July 13, 2007 staff report, including that we need to establish a new aviation forecast that spells out when growth will occur at the region's airports, and that the forecasts should address cargo growth and business jet traffic as well. He said it should reflect the projected future cost of travel, which has been declining in real terms, but may change due in part to increasing fuel prices; airline strategies at individual airports will also be an important input. He said the forecast will be looking at potential demand at new airports in places such as Santa Rosa, Buchanan, Stockton, Moffett, Sacramento, and others that may help address capacity shortfalls; therefore the forecasts will have to take into account the geographic location of air passenger demand in the Bay Area to determine the ability of these various airports to serve potential markets. He recommended that

a tracking system be developed and implemented that looked at changes in various forecast model inputs to see how changes in income, airline profits, fuel prices and other variables affect the region's aviation demand forecast.



Mr. Bates asked whether the analysis would consider a scenario where United Airlines chose other flight routing strategies than the hub and spoke system. Mr. Brittle said that the prior 2000 RASP forecast was quite detailed and did look at the airline route strategies, but was uncertain whether the funding available for Phase 2 forecast would be sufficient for this kind of detailed look.

He said we propose to look at their current strategies. He noted that one option in the recommendations was to look at whether regional flights to and from SFO could be substituted with express buses for cities such as Monterey, Sacramento, etc. Mr. Bates said that Las Vegas now has flights to London, and he speculated that Denver likely had similar service. This could indicate that there may be markets for new direct service from cities just outside of the Bay Area. Mr. Brittle agreed that exploring route strategies at these outlying airports for new direct service would be a worthwhile inquiry for Phase 2. Ms. McKenney said that the forecast should look at strategic trend analysis and scenarios of various future outcomes to ensure that we bracket the projected future. She said this type of forecast could better inform decisions about airport system improvements in lieu of a straight-line forecast.

Mr. Sperring said that, with regard to forecast indicators, the last time RAPC was discussing capacity expansion at the commercial airports, the public perception was that it was driven by the commercial airports, and not driven by travel demand within the region. He asked what could be done in explaining what triggers the need for new capacity so that the public better understands the linkage between demand and capacity improvement projects. Mr. Brittle said that one trigger is flight delay, which was quite high in 2000. He noted that the current forecast update will predict the timeframe when capacity problems will arise at the three major commercial airports. The FAA, in its most recent national capacity report says OAK will run out of capacity in 2015 and SFO in 2025, which is one trigger. But he agrees with Mr. Sperring that the types of triggers the public can understand also include regional drivers, such as population, job and income growth and airfares. Mr. Sperring said, that RAPC's policies should clearly state that, as we approach certain thresholds, specific decisions or choices between alternatives need to be made about capacity.

Mr. Novak highlighted the situation at Las Vegas, where the County has tremendous revenue, but the airport improvement project is estimated to cost \$7 billion, and is beyond the financial means of even that community. He said that the environmental, airspace and institutional problems are difficult to overcome. He said that with the new aircraft, which fly longer point-to-point trips, there is the potential to spend money on construction of new airport capacity that may not be needed, when relying on traditional triggering mechanisms. These mechanisms may seem obvious, but it's not that simple to settle on one or a few measures to determine when to build, because it is a very dynamic, complex aviation system, and we should be very cautious about how the triggers are viewed and what decisions are based on a certain set of facts.

Ms. Rinsler said that Mr. Novak is right, and the difference between Las Vegas and the Bay Area is they have lots of land. She said if it is that difficult for a region with land and money to build an airport, it will be more difficult for us here to pursue solutions involving construction of additional airport infrastructure. For that reason, we need to be thoughtful in Phase 2 to carefully consider demand management, and how we look at whether to build more infrastructure. She said that some have criticized RAPC for not focusing enough on the general

aviation airports in Phase 1 and these airports may, over the next 20-30 years, become small commercial airports. In Phase 2, we need to look carefully at the kinds of investments we may need to make in these communities based on growth patterns and population in the region. She said that new runways at SFO are estimated to cost \$6 to \$10 billion, which is the main reason

that John Martin and others are saying that new runways are off the table, not so much because of the environmental and political issues, which are also insurmountable. She said one airport and one entity cannot finance construction of these facilities. For these reasons, we need to be very creative and thoughtful about what these triggers are going forward. She said the FAA has triggers for construction of landside facilities like runways and terminals that require airports to start designing new facilities when they are at 60 percent capacity, and have them online when they are at 80 percent capacity; however this is not happening at the commercial airports in the region. She said demand management and growth-induced demand for infrastructure are important future considerations.

Ms. Mossar said it is important for the region to do what is needed to accommodate increasing demand. She said what she heard Mr. Spering say is that the best way to do that is get the residents of the Bay Area invested in the policies that guide those decisions. So, to the extent that the planning process is conducted from a technical, airline, airspace, FAA, perspective, the residents will not buy in. She suggested that we should change the conversation to one based on decisions made by the region's residents, e.g., based on growth in the region. This will be easier for residents and policy makers to understand and be invested in the decisions. She said during the SFO runway debate, she spoke with many people who fly frequently who could not understand why people were against runway construction. She said that the region did not have a conversation about how excess demand affected people's daily lives, or what the economic impacts of not building infrastructure were. She said those are the kinds of triggers Mr. Spering was advocating. Mr. Waldeck said that perhaps what is being proposed is triggering mechanisms, not precise trigger points.

Mr. Spering said that Mr. Novak's reply to his suggestion went from triggering mechanisms to construction, which is not what he intended, and is confusing to the public. He said what he was advocating was a public process that informs the public about the issues, and establishes triggers to identify when the public needs to begin discussing how to solve capacity problems before we are in a crisis situation. He said he was not advocating that specific triggers be tied to specific infrastructure solutions. It may be a solution that doesn't involve infrastructure.

Mr. Novak said he understood Mr. Spering's intentions. He said it is still very difficult to establish triggers, and to boil down the complexities of the aviation system for a public discussion. The response time for solutions is so long that, by the time you've solved an identified problem, you're in a completely new environment. For example, construction of the Denver airport was in response to capacity problems at Stapelton Airport, which turned out to be short-lived, and now this very large new airport, which was completed almost ten years later, is underutilized and the context is completely different. He said it will be difficult to explain the problem to the public whether we have a crisis or not, and so we may have to think in a completely different way when we go into a public forum.

Mr. Bates agreed with Mr. Novak about the difficulty in defining triggers. He said the Port of Oakland has seen a 20 percent growth in cargo but fewer ship calls because the ships are bigger. Similarly he said we don't know what the impact of new larger capacity planes will be or the impact of these planes flying longer distances. He said we are unsure about where to accommodate the increase in corporate jet traffic, but we probably do not want them at SFO because of congestion. He said aviation cargo growth, particularly at SFO and Oakland does not

appear to make sense because of difficult ground transportation access. He said accommodating cargo growth at Stockton Airport, or elsewhere, where it could have ready access to rail may be a better solution. He said educating the public is a huge task, and we need to come up with a way to inform the public about what the trade-offs are of different choices, and make it understandable.

Ms. McKenney said that airports should be viewed as public infrastructure similar to schools, sewers and water supply. She said the public discussions of aviation needs should be recast to make this point. In response to Mr. Bates' comment about the Port of Oakland shipping situation, Ms. Rinsler said that currently, in the aviation industry, aircraft size is unfortunately going down. She said SFO is working against that trend with its demand management efforts to encourage an increase in aircraft size. She said the New York area is experiencing the same issue of the use of smaller aircraft. RAPC could recommend solutions that change the FAA's regulatory process to allow airports and the FAA to have more influence in the market place, contrary to the current focus on deregulation. She said limited runway capacity forces us to look at these solutions. Mr. Spering agreed with Mr. Bates about the Port of Oakland example, but he said the impact of the trucks carrying that cargo through the I-80/680 interchange creates tremendous congestion, and we should have had a regional discussion five to 10 years ago to address that issue, rather than now when it's a crisis situation. He said this type of discussion is what he is advocating with regard to airports. He also said airports need to develop supporters, because it is a political solution as much as a technical one.

**b. Air Traffic Control Technology Panel.** At the Committee's request, Mr. Brittle skipped the review of the findings to focus on the recommendations for the air traffic control technology topic. Mr. Brittle stated that the panelists reported that there are a number of technologies that could be helpful in solving our runway capacity problems, but that the research and systems integration work needed to deploy them was not taking place. He said some panelists hoped that RAPC could lend its support to various research efforts to advance testing or deployment of these technologies, such as letters to the FAA Administrator or Congress. He said that RAPC should receive and review reports from the FAA in Phase 2 about the status of key new technologies. He stated that no technologies have been eliminated from further consideration and that Phase 2 would perform more analysis of the most promising technologies and their capacity benefits. As an example, he mentioned that one panelist (Tom Cornell) had explained how more precise airline arrival and departure flight tracks could reduce interactions between aircraft taking off and landing at Bay Area airports and increase airspace capacity.

He said that general aviation airports are going to play an increasingly important role in helping to serve future aviation demand, and new technologies could enable aircraft to use these airports in all types of weather. This will be an important factor in helping relieve pressure on the commercial airports. He mentioned the impact of improving Simultaneous Offset Instrument Approach (SOIA) at SFO as another example of how technology could improve poor weather runway arrival rates. Finally, we heard about various technologies that may enable us to put aircraft closer together when landing at the airports that would increase capacity from our existing runways. Other future technologies could help detect wake turbulence to enable arriving aircraft to be spaced closer together. Ultimately, the goal would be to understand the impact of all of these technologies working together in a comprehensive airspace study. He said this was beyond the scope of Phase 2, but might be a project for Phase 3.

Mr. Brittle said the Committee has expressed interest in Continuous Descent Approaches, which can provide a number of environmental benefits, including reduced noise, fuel consumption and emissions. He said these procedures have mostly been tested during low-traffic periods at airports, and the question is whether RAPC wishes to explore this with the FAA for some of our airports.

Mr. Novak said that the current administration has redesigned the national air traffic control system by combining regions, reducing the number from nine to three. He said this consolidation caused tremendous change in the organization, and many positions remained unfilled. He said the overall plan is to redesign the nation's entire airspace. He said that any

project requiring analysis of airspace at this point, such as airspace design for a new Las Vegas airport, will require considerable time to complete. He said this notion of the GAA's handling commercial aircraft raises significant capital investment issues. These airports would need additional avionics, security facilities, and a variety of other requirements before the FAA could approve commercial service. He said financing these improvements, including things such as fire engines, would be difficult for general aviation airports.

Ms. McKenney said that the Bay Area's current airspace was designed a very long time ago, when air traffic control technology was very different and the level of traffic was lower. She said that, although the controllers do a fantastic job, the current design incorporates a lot of waste, and that, with more modern technology and airspace redesign, we could get more capacity out of our existing runways, especially when we look at how difficult it is to develop new runways. She said that, although it may take a long time, the fact that the FAA is pursuing this on a national level might be an opportunity for us. Mr. Chu said that implementation of global positioning system (GPS) technology for aircraft landing patterns could increase capacity by 20 to 30 percent. He said the protocols for landing aircraft were designed prior to the advent of GPS technology, which requires greater flight separations than may be necessary. Mr. Bates said that some of the things we investigate in Phases 1 and 2 should be explored further in Phase 3.

**c. Demand Management Panel.** Mr. Brittle said the recommendations from the demand management panel are generally to keep most of the options on the table, because we do not know which may be feasible or effective. During Phase 2, staff recommends examining up-gauging aircraft (increasing the average size of aircraft operating at each airport), and spreading flights out so they are not all packed into the peak period. Another recommendation would be to have SFO brief RAPC and the public about its ongoing efforts to explore demand management strategies, and have RAPC provide SFO with feedback. He said the report recommends that OAK consider demand management strategies prior to the onset of major runway congestion, given that the FAA's recent FACT 2 report indicates that Oakland may be on the threshold of experiencing major congestion on its air carrier runway. He acknowledged that demand management strategies should be tailored to the unique conditions at an airport, and Oakland's problems are different from those at SFO.

He said that our recommendation for pursuing a pilot congestion pricing mechanism may no longer be relevant because the current House and Senate versions for the FAA reauthorization legislation does not include such a program. As a result, he said staff was unsure whether RAPC should push for this. He said if RAPC decides to pursue this, and Bay Area airports become involved in congestion pricing, RAPC might want to advocate for legislation that relaxes the revenue-neutral constraint that current FAA policy requires. This would enable airports to charge landing fees that are not revenue neutral. Frank Berardino and other panelists indicated their belief that landing fees would need to be set high in order to be effective, and this would result in more revenues compared to airport costs.

Mr. Brittle said that Mark Hansen's suggestions gave rise to staff's preliminary recommendation that RAPC explore whether small plane commuter flights from close-by cities (like Monterey, Fresno, Chico, etc.) that are currently impacting runway capacity, could be shifted to inter-regional express bus service on those days when high delay is expected. Finally, he said that staff recommends that, in order to clarify when capacity shortfalls are approaching

at major airports, a tracking system of key runway capacity indicators be developed to inform us of when problems are on the horizon.

Mr. Chu asked whether capacity constraints were due to runway or gate shortfalls. Mr. Brittle said it could be either, but generally the airports try to match their gate capacity to their runway capacity. Ms. McKenney said that airports typically do not look at landside facilities, such as gates, as a capacity constraint. She said Oakland is approaching the point where they may not have enough gates. She said in the Bay Area, runway capacity is the primary constraining factor. Mr. Chu asked whether taxiways could be a constraining factor and, are they considered part of the runway concerns? Ms. McKenney said that airfield capacity is looked at as a system, and that includes runways, taxiways and gates.

Mr. Chu said that he thought the airlines already use congestion pricing by the different prices they charge for flying at different times of day, and that if they can do it, RAPC should be able to pursue it. Ms. McKenney encouraged RAPC to pursue lobbying Congress for the types of changes that we would like to see in the aviation system, because currently, legislators are lobbied by the airlines, and RAPC's input is important and valid. Ms. Rinsler agreed that RAPC should not give up on congestion pricing, just because the recommendation for a pilot program is not in Congress' version of the FAA reauthorization legislation. She said SFO is trying to consider all possible solutions, and the revenue neutrality issue is a significant constraint; so changing the mentality in Washington is going to be very important, even if California has to pursue an independent agenda. Ms. Mossar said that if the public understood that increased fees for congestion pricing at airports were a benefit to them, then our legislators would be interested in accommodating that, but the public doesn't understand the issue and potential benefits. Ms. Rinsler said that RAPC may want to consider developing concepts for a mitigation fund, where excess revenues from congestion pricing could be deposited for use on airport related improvements. She said this is an untested area in the US, but in Europe, there may be successful examples.

In response to Mr. Waldeck's question on the expansion of the Santa Rosa (Charles Schulz) Airport, Mr. Salmon said that currently, the Airport is completing its master plan for a small runway expansion that will allow the airport to accommodate a different type of airplane, and will allow planes to leave on an expanded schedule because the summer hot weather currently limits take-offs. He said the master plan is scheduled for public release in September, followed by preparation of an EIR. He said that through public outreach, the public has accepted the new commercial service operated by Horizon Air, consisting currently of 8 to 12 flights per day, with plans for expanding the service. He said since traffic is currently low, the service is viewed positively, but that could change if service levels increased. He said RAPC could advance the concept of regional airports by helping to identify mitigations that can be implemented to offset the impacts of commercial service, such as noise, vertical approach heights, etc. He said that, as the discussion of spreading traffic out to the region progresses, these types of solutions will be needed to get public support, which is essential. He said sharing information about the types of planes that would be landing is important.

Mr. Ward said that demand management will likely be the area of inquiry that is easiest for the public to understand, and that as part of Phase 2, we should really push to educate the public about this subject. He said demand management is discussed in terms commonly used in land use planning, which makes it easier to connect to people who are already engaged in other land use planning issues. He said it would be easier to build interest in other issues from that base of public involvement and understanding.



**d. Institutional Arrangements and Governance Panel.** Chris Brittle said the panelists recommended that any discussion of governance needs to be guided by a clear definition of the problem and a consensus on the regional solution. Then it will be possible to figure out where institutional changes fit in as a means to solve the problem. He said staff's recommendation for

Phase 2 could provide a head start on this issue by evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of new institutional arrangements relative to a specific set of planning issues that were brought to the Committee in the June 8, 2007 staff report. He said the main options the committee discussed were a new authority, a joint powers authority and a memorandum of understanding. He said if Phase 2 determines that institutional change would be helpful, we would further explore that in Phase 3.

**e. Public Comment.** David Lewis from Save the Bay said there is a tremendous amount of material and issues for RAPC to address. RAPC should ask the FAA for additional funding, because the FAA has told the Bay Area that we are a national model for regional aviation planning and we need additional resources to successfully address all of the issues.

He said with regard to aviation trends, it is important to learn from the past and the 2000 RASPA effort. He said it is important that we not be constrained from exploring things because they were not in a particular piece of legislation, or were not legal or authorized at the time. He said now is the time to be visionary and think outside of the box, and include some of those things. He said the methodology used to develop forecasts and trends is important; the last time the aviation forecast was developed, there was some broad criticism of those forecasts, not because they turned out to be wrong, but for other reasons.

He said, regarding air traffic control technology, RAPC should be informed of FAA and NASA schedules of when technologies will come on line, but should not be limited by those assessments. He said because the FAA is conservative in its assessments of the timing of when technologies can be deployed, RAPC should seek independent assessments of this, and not be constrained by agency perspectives. He said there is a difference between when a technology might be right and when the institutions are ready to adopt them. He said one reason to do this is that RAPC might be able to push, if the technology is right for the problem, and not be constrained by the FAA schedule.

He said on demand management, the issues were similar. He recommended that RAPC not be constrained by something that is not authorized currently. He said if RAPC researches the issues and determines that a particular legislative change is needed to implement the desired solution, RAPC should pursue it. The Bay Area delegation is well positioned to move these kinds of changes. He said by the time the report is finished, there will be a new administration, which could open up other new possibilities, so RAPC should not be constrained now in its approach to all of the demand management options, including congestion pricing.

He said on airport governance, he agreed with Mr. Brittle that defining the goals first for this region was important. He said RAPC should articulate how new institutional arrangements could help achieve those goals more efficiently and effectively than our current institutions.

He said in Phase 2, RAPC should be visionary, and should try to incorporate that vision into the Phase 2 scope of work. He said put the most effort into those things the region has most control over. He said much of the aviation and air industry is not in the control of this Committee, or the Bay Area. He said RAPC can shape the Bay Area's aviation future by what we choose or choose not to build and how we change institutionally, or not. He said instead of feeling like hostages to the aviation forecast, we should be focusing at the end of the process on recommendations that help us create the quality of life and the type of region we want to create

and the aviation industry can adjust to that. He said the reason the ABAG, BCDC and MTC were jointly planning for the region's aviation needs was so that a wide range of issues could be addressed.

He said the public can adjust more easily to changes than the institutions or airlines. He said airlines are operating on thin margins and feel constrained and unable to adapt to very much change. He said it takes a long time to change an airport, but the public, business and industry can adjust to whatever we do or do not build here. He said that does not mean we should not try to create something better, but the public is the least of the challenges. He said, when the bullets in the Phase 2 work program are turned into work plan and timeline, try to incorporate the vision development and out of the box thinking. Also, get public comment early on, in lieu of waiting to do that at the end.

**9. Staff Report on Proposed Phase 2 Work Scope Outline and Decision Process.** Mr. LaClair presented the staff recommendation on the Phase 2 Work Scope Outline. He said that the Committee generated a lot of ideas during its discussion of Phase 1 that staff will incorporate into its revised recommendation. He said that the proposed outline includes an ongoing evaluation of some of the work started in Phase 1 on demand management, new air traffic control technologies, alternative institutional arrangements, as well as the potential for alternative airports to help address the Bay Area's long-term aviation needs. He said some of this work would be funded by grants from the FAA that Mr. Novak outlined earlier. He said that the proposed outline includes an update to the aviation forecast, as was mentioned by Mr. Brittle, an assessment of potential demand at alternative airports, in addition to the commercial airports and the potential for demand diversion to High Speed Rail. It further includes projections for capacity shortfalls at the three Bay Area commercial airports under three or possibly more scenarios, and a mid-point screening step by RAPC to determine which alternatives or strategies should be pursued further. This the work scope outline calls for developing cost estimates for use of alternative airports, a general overview of the environmental and economic issues, and an evaluation of alternative institutional arrangements. He said that two of the work program elements will be ongoing, including public input, and developing a vision and implementation plan for the region.

In response to a question from Mr. Waldeck about potential demand at alternative airports, Mr. LaClair said that Stockton, Monterey and Sacramento airports would all be examined for their potential to accommodate some of the Bay Area aviation demand.

Mr. Bates asked how the recommendations in Mr. Brittle's presentation are reflected in the proposed Phase 2 work scope. Mr. LaClair said that most of the topics in the Phase 2 work scope flow directly out of those recommendations. Mr. Bates said that it is not clear to him how that is, and at the next meeting it would be beneficial to have a more clear description of how those two are connected. Mr. LaClair said that the outline nature of staff's description of the Phase 2 work elements does not make it clear what the linkages are. When staff develops the next iteration of the Phase 2 work plan for consideration at the public workshop, it will be in a narrative form that will demonstrate a clear linkage between the Phase 1 conclusions and recommendations, and what is being proposed for the Phase 2 work, as well as the valuable input from the Committee and the public at today's meeting.

Mr. Bates, said aviation demand forecasting and other elements in the proposed Phase 2 work scope are really specific, and it is unclear how they relate to the Phase 2 work scope. He said this proposal seems to depart from the recommendations presented by Mr. Brittle and it seems that they should be well connected. Mr. LaClair said the comment is well noted and we will articulate it better in the next iteration. Regarding the aviation forecasts, he said that

updating the aviation forecasts was included in the recommendation that Mr. Brittle made based on input from the Aviation Trends panel, so that the Committee would have a good base line going forward about the likely aviation demand at all of the Bay Area airports. Mr. Bates said that some of the recommendations will require additional funding that we do not yet have

secured, and he would like to see an action plan that showed how we were going to advance each of the recommendations for Phase 2. He said if we find that we do not have enough funding, we may have to go back to the FAA to seek more funding.

Mr. Chu noted that in the previous discussion, staff mentioned how the advent of the new business light jets might affect general aviation. He said it would be desirable to discuss in the aviation forecast what the impacts of the different aircraft types (e.g., the Airbus 350, the Airbus 380, the Boeing 787 Dreamliner and the Boeing 737-800) would be on capacity, including whether the new 737 could land at Santa Rosa. It may be that the newer 737s can fly longer distances but don't carry any more passengers, so they wouldn't increase capacity. He said that it is important to understand whether the new generation of airplanes will change the demand for operations, and that this should be part of the discussion of the aviation forecast.

Mr. Waldeck said that he understood that the Phase 2 work scope is a placeholder at this time that requires a leap of faith for the Committee, and that he would prefer to have more detail so it is a little less of a leap of faith. He said for new Committee members, he would like an overview of the Phase 1 status shared with the Committee, perhaps via email.

Ms. Mossar said that she agreed with Mr. Bates that there was a disconnect from the Phase 1 recommendations and the Phase 2 work scope. She requested that the Phase 1 recommendations be inserted into the Phase 2 work scope outline and identify them as such. That will demonstrate to the Committee that the two documents are linked. She said she was uncomfortable saying that this scope of work is correct until that has been done. Mr. LaClair thanked the Committee for its input and comments on the proposal and said that the proposal was not presented for Committee action today, but for input to be revised for the public workshop.

Ms. Fredericks said that when the forecast is developed, she assumed it would be done using standardized models. She requested that, when we are looking at alternate airports, the assessment of links to ground transportation access be integrated. For example, in Sacramento, consideration should be given to the high-speed train, and when looking at other smaller airports, the available ground transportation will be a significant determinant of their viability for accommodating aviation traffic.

Mr. Barrie said that Caltrans looks forward to working with the Committee in Phase 2. He said that in 2003, Caltrans produced a publication that recommended minimum standards for airport improvements, such as runway widths and lengths, avionics, etc. He said that Caltrans will be updating the publication in 2007, and it may be helpful for the Committee's work assessing general aviation airports.

10. **Adjournment.** The meeting was adjourned at noon.